Appl. No.: 10/713,241 Amdt. Dated: July 15, 2004

Reply to Office Action of: May 4, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Specification

In the specification, the paragraph starting on line 16 of page 12 has been amended to add the description of Figure 10, which illustrates a boundary with a plurality of protrusions (see Illustration A, enclosed). Since the figures form a part of the specification, applicants respectfully submit that no new matter had been added to the specification and that the elements of claim 1 are fully supported by the specification.

Claim Status

Claims 1-17 remain in this application. Claims 11, 14, 16, and 17 have been amended.

Claim Objections.

Claims 11, 14, 16, and 17 have been amended to correct minor editorial problems.

Claim Rejections 35 USC 112.

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Office Action stated that "The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification...The specification does not disclose "the defect boundary including a plurality of protrusions"... the specification does not disclose "the ratio of said distance to pitch has a range from 0.6 to 2.5".

Applicants respectfully disagree with the grounds for this rejection. The feature of claim 1—i.e, "the defect boundary including a plurality of protrusions" is shown, for example, in figure 10 of the Applicants specification. The features of claim 11 and 13 are supported, for example by figure 1 and its description. More specifically, the X-axis of Figure 1 depicts the ratios of about 0.6 to 2.5. The y-axis of Figure 1 depicts the energy fractions ranging between about 0.1 and 1. The claims and the specification teach that to design a band-gap photonic crystal fiber according to claims 11 and 13 one needs to pick the ratios of distance to pitch that are in the 0.6 to 2.5 range and chose from these ratios those that correspond to power mode fraction of 0.6 or higher.

Appl. No.: 10/713,241

Amdt. Dated: July 15, 2004

Reply to Office Action of: May 4, 2004

Conclusion

Based upon the above amendments, remarks, and papers of records, applicant

believes the pending claims of the above-captioned application are in allowable form and

patentable over the prior art of record. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely

Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Applicant believes that no extension of time is necessary to make this Reply

timely. Should applicant be in error, applicant respectfully requests that the Office grant

such time extension pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) as necessary to make this Reply

timely, and hereby authorizes the Office to charge any necessary fee or surcharge with

respect to said time extension to the deposit account of the undersigned firm of attorneys,

Deposit Account 03-3325.

Please direct any questions or comments to Svetlana Z. Short at 607-974-0412.

Respectfully submitted,

DATE: 7/15/04

Svetlana Z. Short

Attorney for Assignee

Reg. No. 34,432

Corning Incorporated

SP-TI-03-1

Corning, NY 14831

607-974-0412

7